Astronomy & Astrophysics manuscript no. aa_archiv
August 28, 2014
©ESO 2014

arXiv:1408.6236v1 [astro-ph.SR] 26 Aug 2014

Spectroscopic Signatures of Extra-Tidal Stars Around the Globular Clusters NGC 6656 (M22), NGC 3201 and NGC 1851 from RAVE

A. Kunder[1], G. Bono[2,3], T. Piffl[4], M. Steinmetz[1], E. K. Grebel[5], B. Anguiano[6,7], K. Freeman[8], G. Kordopatis[9], T. Zwitter[10], R. Scholz[1], B. K. Gibson[11,12], J. Bland-Hawthorn[13], G. Seabroke[14], C. Boeche[5], A. Siebert[15], R.F.G. Wyse[16], O. Bienaymé[15], J. Navarro[17], A. Siviero[18], I. Minchev[1], Q. Parker[6,7,19], W. Reid[6,7], G. Gilmore[9], U. Munari[20] and A. Helmi[21]

[1] Leibniz-Institut für Astrophysics (AIP), An der Sternwarte 16, 14482 Potsdam Germany
e-mail: akunder@aip.de
[2] Dipartimento di Fisica, Universita di Roma Tor Vergata, Rome, Italy
[3] INAF–Osservatorio Astronomico di Roma, via Frascati 33 00040 Monte Porzio Catone, Italy
[4] Rudolf Peierls Centre for Theoretical Physics, 1 Keble Road, Oxford, OX1 3NP, UK
[5] Astronomisches Rechen-Institut, Zentrum für Astronomie der Universität Heidelberg, Mönchhofstr. 12-14, D-69120 Heidelberg, Germany
[6] Department of Physics & Astronomy, Macquarie University, Sydney, NSW 2109 Australia
[7] Research Centre for Astronomy, Astrophysics and Astrophotonics, Macquarie University, Sydney, NSW 2109 Australia
[8] Research School of Astronomy & Astrophysics, The Australian National University, Canberra, Australia
[9] Institute of Astronomy, Cambridge University, Madingley Road, Cambridge CB3 0HA, UK
[10] University of Ljubljana, Faculty of Mathematics and Physics, Jadranska 19, 1000 Ljubljana, Slovenia
[11] Institute for Computational Astrophysics, Dept of Astronomy & Physics, Saint Mary University, Halifax, NS, BH3 3C3, Canada
[12] Jeremiah Horrocks Institute, University of Central Lancashire, Preston, PR1 2HE, United Kingdom
[13] Sydney Institute for Astronomy, School of Physics A28, University of Sydney, NSW 2006, Australia
[14] Mullard Space Science Laboratory, University College London, Holmbury St Mary, Dorking, RH5 6NT, UK
[15] Observatoire Astronomique de Strasbourg, Université de Strasbourg, CNRS, UMR 7550, 11 rue de l'Université, F-67000 Strasbourg, France
[16] Department of Physics and Astronomy, Johns Hopkins University, 3400 North Charles Street, Baltimore, MD 21218
[17] Senior CIfAR Fellow, Department of Physics and Astronomy, University of Victoria, Victoria, BC, Canada V8P 5C2
[18] Department of Physics and Astronomy, Padova University, Vicolo dell'Osservatorio 2, 35122 Padova, Italy
[19] Australian Astronomical Observatory, PO Box 915, North Ryde, NSW 1670, Australia
[20] INAF National Institute of Astrophysics, Astronomical Observatory of Padova, 36012 Asiago (VI), Italy
[21] Kapteyn Astronomical Institute, University of Groningen, P.O. Box 800, 9700 AV Groningen, The Netherlands

A&A accepted, Aug 2014

ABSTRACT

Context. Stellar population studies of globular clusters have suggested that the brightest clusters in the Galaxy might actually be the remnant nuclei of dwarf spheroidal galaxies. If the present Galactic globular clusters formed within larger stellar systems, they are likely surrounded by extra-tidal halos and/or tails made up of stars that were tidally stripped from their parent systems.
Aims. The stellar surroundings around globular clusters are therefore one of the best places to look for the remnants of an ancient dwarf galaxy. Here an attempt is made to search for tidal debris around the supernovae (SNe) enriched globular clusters M22 and NGC 1851 as well as the kinematically unique cluster NGC 3201.
Methods. The stellar parameters from the Radial Velocity Experiment (RAVE) are used to identify stars with RAVE metallicities, radial velocities and elemental-abundances consistent with the abundance patterns and properties of the stars in M22, NGC 1851 and NGC 3201.
Results. The discovery of RAVE stars that may be associated with M22 and NGC 1851 are reported, some of which are at projected distances of ∼10 degrees away from the core of these clusters. Numerous RAVE stars associated with NGC 3201 suggest that either the tidal radius of this cluster is underestimated, or that there are some unbound stars extending a few arc minutes from the edge of the cluster's radius. No further extra-tidal stars associated with NGC 3201 could be identified. The bright magnitudes of the RAVE stars make them easy targets for high resolution follow-up observations, allowing an eventual further chemical tagging to solidify (or exclude) stars outside the tidal radius of the cluster as tidal debris. In both our radial velocity histograms of the regions surrounding NGC 1851 and NGC 3201, a peak of stars at ∼230 km s^{-1} is seen, consistent with extended tidal debris from ω Centauri.

Key words. Galaxy: evolution – Galaxy: formation – Galaxy: globular clusters: individual: M22 – Galaxy: globular clusters: individual: NGC 1851– Galaxy: stellar content – Galaxy: structure

1. Introduction

The classical Searle & Zinn (1978) scenario of the formation of the Milky Way predicts that the halo globular clusters (GCs) formed in larger dwarf galaxies. Upon the accretion of smaller galaxies, dark matter, stars, gas and in some cases GCs (Da Costa & Armandroff 1995; Peñarrubia, Walker & Gilmore 2009) will remain in the halo of the more massive galaxy. They will then add to any pre-existing GC population (Searle & Zinn 1978; Zinnecker et al. 1988; Freeman 1993; Abadi, Navarro & Steinmetz 2006, Forbes & Bridges 2010; Leaman, VandenBerg, & Mendel 2013).

There is now good evidence that two of the most luminous GCs in the Milky Way are the nuclei of dwarf galaxies (e.g., ω Centauri, Lee et al. 1999, and M54 is associated with the Sagittarius dwarf spheroidal galaxy, Sarajedini & Layden 1995). Also, in the past two decades, observational studies have shown the presence of tidal tails around globular clusters (e.g., Grillmair et al. 1995, 1996; Holland et al. 1997; Lehmann & Scholz 1997; Leon et al. 1999, 2000; Testa et al. 2000; Odenkirchen et al. 2001, 2003; Sohn et al. 2003; Lee et al. 2003, 2004; Jordi & Grebel 2010). Some of these tidal tails show structures elongated for ∼45 degrees on the sky (e.g., NGC 5466 Belokurov et al. 2006; Grillmair & Dionatos 2006) and ∼22 degrees on the sky, (e.g., Palomar 5, Grillmair & Dionatos 2006). Several other stellar debris features associated with globular clusters have also been identified, some with a possible origin from known GCs (e.g., NGC 288, Grillmair et al. 2013) and some associated with unknown clusters (Grillmair 2009, 2011; Williams et al. 2011; Wylie-de Boer et al. 2012), awaiting further and/or deeper imaging and spectroscopy to confirm such an association.

There is evidence that Galactic globulars can be split into two sub-samples, the ones that formed in situ and those that have been accreted. The exact fraction is still under debate and depends on the criteria adopted to constrain the kinematics (e.g., Salaris & Weiss 2002; Marín-Franch et al. 2009; VandenBerg et al. 2013; Leaman et al. 2013). The two sub-samples cover a broad range in metal-abundance and in total mass. This means that the latter parameter does not allow us to discriminate between the two sub-groups. More recent findings suggest that the in situ GCs and the accreted ones do obey two different age-metallicity relations (VandenBerg et al. 2013). This evidence, once confirmed by independent analysis, might provide the opportunity to discriminate the origin of GCs. The above authors suggested that the in situ clusters are, at fixed age, ∼0.5 dex more metal-rich.

Mackey et al. (2004) utilized the horizontal branch (HB) morphology of a large sample of Milky Way GCs, together with GCs in dwarf spheroidal galaxies, to propose that accretion onto the early Milky Way was substantial, with 41 (27 per cent) of the GCs in the Milky Way being accreted. Using blue halo stars, Unavane, Wyse & Gilmore (1996) suggested an accretion fraction closer to 10 per cent. More recently, Forbes & Bridges (2010) suggest that 27 – 47 GCs (∼1/4 of the entire system), from six to eight dwarf galaxies, were accreted to build the Milky Way GC system we see today. The age-metallicity relation (AMR) of Milky Way GCs further seems to support that the metal-poor GCs were formed in relatively low-mass (dwarf) galaxies and later accreted by the MW (Leaman et al. 2013), although this is still not a settled issue (see e.g., Marín-Franch et al. 2009).

Whereas tidal tails originating from a cluster could indicate that the cluster is the remnant of an ancient galaxy progressively disrupted by the interaction with the Milky Way potential, internal processes including stellar evolution, gas expulsion, and two-body relaxation (e.g., Geyer & Burkert 2001; Kroupa 2001) can also dissolve a GC. For example, Gnedin & Ostriker (1997) show how disk shocking affects each star in the cluster as it crosses the disk, leading to the result that stars close to the tidal boundary can be lost during disk crossing events given that this extra energy allows them to escape from the star cluster. Simulations further show that tidal features are expected for e.g., GCs on eccentric orbits near their apogalacticon (Montuori et al. 2007). Gnedin & Ostriker (1997) find that more than half of the present Galactic GCs are to be destroyed within the next Hubble time. One might expect some difference in the stellar populations (e.g. age, elemental abundances) in the tails and main body if the cluster were indeed a remnant of a larger system in which there were gradients, although the extent may need to be considered on a case-by-case basis.

It is now accepted that most, if not all, Milky Way GCs have had at least two epochs of star formation (e.g., see the reviews by Gratton et al. 2004, 2012a). A first epoch of star formation gave origin to the 'normal' (first-generation) stars, with CNO and other abundances similar to Population II field stars of the same metallicity. Afterwards, some other epoch of star formation (second-generation) occurred, including material heavily processed through the CNO cycle. Hence, dissolved massive globular clusters can be traced by the chemical signature of their second-generation stars, which tend to be enhanced in light elements. Using such light element abundance anomalies in present-day halo field stars, Martell & Grebel (2010) and Martell et al. (2011) suggest that at least 17% of the present-day stellar mass of the Milky Way halo originally formed in globular clusters.

GC streams can be some of the coldest stellar substructures yet discovered (e.g. Combes et al. 1999; Odenkirchen et al. 2009; Willett et al. 2009), especially compared to early accretion/dissolution events which would result in low surface brightness, dynamically hotter and spatially extended substructures. Large samples of such streams can therefore provide the possibility to map the distribution of Galactic dark matter with much greater spatial resolution than what is presently possible (e.g., Murali & Dubinski 1999). Especially large field studies observed in the framework of the e.g., Sloan Digitial Sky Survey (SDSS; York et al. 2000) and Wide-Field Infrared Survey Explorer (WISE; Wright et al. 2010) have led to an extensive mapping and detection of GC tidal tails. The RAdial Velocity Experiment ((RAVE) Steinmetz et al. 2006) is one of the few kinematic surveys that has also made discoveries of stellar streams associated with globular clusters (e.g., Williams et al. 2011; Wylie-de Boer et al. 2012). To date, RAVE has gathered a half-a-million medium resolution spectra (R∼7500) of stars in the Southern sky, and because RAVE's input catalogue is magnitude limited ($8 < I < 13$), the stellar sample is essentially homogeneous and free of kinematic biases. The catalogued stars lie mostly within 2.5 kpc of the Sun (e.g., Burnett et al. 2011; Binney et al. 2014), although stars also belonging to the Large Magellanic Cloud at a distance of ∼50 kpc have been identified within RAVE (Munari et al. 2009).

In this paper, the first results from a search for extra-tidal stars around the halo GCs M22, NGC 1851 and NGC 3201 in the RAVE survey footprint are presented. These clusters were chosen for a number of reasons. First, unlike a number of other clusters within the RAVE footprint, they were not specifically targeted by RAVE, so the relative frequency of stars identified within the cluster tidal radius and outside the cluster tidal radius can be directly compared. Second, these clusters are already good candidates for having an extra-galactic origin. Third,

these clusters have radial velocities and/or [Fe/H] abundances that are largely offset from disk field stars seen in projection along that line of sight, reducing field star contamination issues. Lastly, a number of stars within these clusters have already been well-studied spectroscopically, so the light elements of potential extra-tidal candidates can provide important clues as to their cluster association. The basic properties and distances of these clusters are listed in Table 1.

We define an extra-tidal star to be an unbound star when it exceeds the tidal radius (e.g., Meylan & Heggie 1997), as N-body models show that this leads to consistent results (Giersz & Heggie 1997). RAVE red giant candidates in M22, NGC 1851 and NGC 3201, are presented, which lie outside the cluster tidal radius, but which were still likely born in these clusters as evidenced by their radial velocities, metallicities and elemental-abundances.

2. Detection in RAVE

The fourth data release (DR4) of RAVE contains stellar atmospheric parameters (effective temperature, surface gravity, overall metallicity), radial velocities, individual abundances and distances determined for 425 561 stars (Kordopatis et al. 2013). This wealth of information and the extensive spatial distribution presents an ideal foundation for our study. From this sample, 187 305 stars have spectra for which the chemical abundance pipeline is able to determine abundances for magnesium, aluminum, silicon, titanium, iron and nickel (Boeche et al. 2011). The uncertainties on these quantities vary as a function of signal-to-noise (SNR), number of lines that could be measured, and also depend on the specific element. Typically, the uncertainty in [Fe/H] is ∼0.23 dex, the uncertainty for Mg, Al, and Si is ∼0.2 dex, and the uncertainty for Ti and Ni is ∼0.3 dex (see discussion and Figures 13-17 in Kordopatis et al. 2013, for further details). Because the GCs NGC 3201 and NGC 1851 have stars with radial velocities offset from the rest of the field population by at least one hundred km s^{-1}, stars belonging to these clusters can be provisionally identified from their radial velocities, colors and magnitudes alone.

Whenever possible, RAVE stellar abundances are used to further link extra-tidal stars to a cluster, although the number of RAVE spectra with reliable abundances is not nearly as extensive (∼1/4 the sample) as the RAVE sample of stars with well-determined radial velocities. However, it is not always obvious that the metallicity of an extra-tidal star should be the same as a cluster star, e.g., if the metallicities of extra-tidal stars should be the same between the GC and its dwarf galaxy host. For example, if a closed-box model of chemical evolution is assumed, and assuming that the yield of each generation of stars is constant, then the variation of metallicity (Z) with time can be expressed as

$$Z(t) = -\rho \; ln \frac{M_g(t)}{M_g(0)} \quad (1)$$

(Binney & Merrifield 1998). Here, $[M_g(t)/M_g(0)]$ is the ratio of gas masses, and is unity at t = 0 and zero at the present time (t = 14 Gyr). The yield is given by ρ. Setting ρ to 0.005 so as to match the zero point of the Sagittarius dwarf spheroidal galaxy (Sgr) age-metallicity relation, of which the globular cluster M54 is thought to be the nucleus (Layden & Sarajedini 2000), then [Fe/H] would become more metal-rich by ∼0.5 dex with every ∼4 Gyr that passed. Hence, if we accept the possibility that a nucleated dwarf galaxy, with a Milky Way GC as its nucleus, formed stars continuously in relative isolation with little or no infall or release of its interstellar gas, and that the yield is similar to that of Sgr, then we would not expect a large difference in [Fe/H] between the GC and the extra- tidal stars, unless we are probing extra-tidal stars with a multiple Gyr age difference from the GC.

It is important to point out, that although a closed-box model of chemical evolution fits the age-metallicity relation of Sgr galaxy as a whole well (Layden & Sarajedini 2000), this is not the case for the formation and evolution of the anomalous GC ω Cen (e.g., Romano et al. 2006). However, the [Fe/H] spread of the stars within ω Cen is still thought to be similar to those in its extended tidal debris (Majewski et al. 2012). Ultimately, it may be that the exact nature of the metallicity of an extra-tidal star linked to a host dwarf galaxy and the metallicity of a star in its nucleus (now observed as a Milky Way GC) depends on the particular cluster/system under study and must be considered on a case-by-case basis.

We also investigated using proper motions of the RAVE stars as an exclusion criterion in the selection of extra-tidal stars, but the errors of available measurements prevented the use of proper motions at this stage. The properties of the GCs studied here are listed in Table 1, taken from Harris (2010 edition of 1996), except for the Wilson (1975) tidal radius, which is from McLaughlin & van der Marel (2005). The columns contain (1) the cluster name, (2) the right ascension in hours, minutes and seconds (epoch J2000), (3) the declination in degrees, arcminutes and arcseconds, (4) the Galactic longitude in degrees, (5) the Galactic latitude in degrees, (6) the distance from Sun in kiloparsecs (kpc), (7) the distance from Galactic center (kpc), assuming R_0=8.0 kpc (e.g., Groenewegen et al. 2008; Matsunaga et al. 2009), (8) the [Fe/H] metallicity, (9) the Heliocentric radial velocity in km s^{-1} (10) the core radius in arcmin, (11) the King (1966) tidal radius in arcmin, and (11) the Wilson (1975) tidal radius in arcmin from McLaughlin & van der Marel (2005).

The specific selection criteria to search for cluster stars belonging to these GCs are listed in Table 2. Briefly, for NGC 3201, we only select candidates based on their radial velocity and the errors in radial velocity measurements. For the cluster NGC 1851, a color criterion is also used, and for M22, only stars with derived metallicities from RAVE are used. Although ideally we would prefer to select cluster stars based on their radial velocity alone, this is only realistic for NGC 3201, the cluster with the most extreme velocity. The AlgoConv criteria indicates which stars have reliable abundances, but as mentioned previously, greatly restricts the sample of RAVE stars. Therefore, this criteria is only adopted for the cluster M22, the cluster with the least extreme radial velocity and for which large reddening effects makes selecting cluster stars by color difficult.

2.1. NGC 3201

NGC 3201 has long been known as a kinematically unique GC: It has the most extreme radial velocity of the Milky Way GCs, with a heliocentric radial velocity of 494 km s^{-1} (2010 edition of Harris 1996). It also has a large azimuthal velocity of 250 km s^{-1} around the Galactic center (Gonzalez & Wallerstein 1998), but in a retrograde sense. These kinematic peculiarities have been taken as strong evidence of a possible extra-Galactic formation with subsequent capture by the Milky Way (e.g., Rodgers & Paltoglou 1984; van den Bergh 1993).

High-resolution spectroscopy carried out on the individual stars in NGC 3201 find that despite its extreme kinematics, NGC 3201 shows no large spread in [Fe/H] compared to the

Table 1. Globular Cluster Sample

Cluster Name	RA (J2000)	Dec (J2000)	l (°)	b (°)	$R_\odot$ (kpc)	R_{GC} (kpc)	[Fe/H] (dex)	V_{LOS} (km s^{-1})	r_c (')	King r_t (')	Wilson r_t (')
NGC 3201	10 17 36.82	−46 24 44.9	277.23	8.64	4.9	8.8	−1.59	494.0	1.30	25.35	54.8
NGC 1851	05 14 06.76	−40 02 47.6	244.51	−35.03	12.1	16.6	−1.18	320.5	0.09	6.52	44.7
NGC 6656 (M22)	18 36 23.94	−23 54 17.1	9.89	−7.55	3.2	4.9	−1.70	−146.3	1.33	31.90	119.9

Table 2. Globular Cluster Member Selection Criteria

Cluster Name	Selection Criteria
NGC 3201	480 km s^{-1} < RV < 510 km s^{-1}; RV error < 10 km s^{-1}
NGC 1851	300 km s^{-1} < RV < 380 km s^{-1}; RV error < 10 km s^{-1}; $K > -7\times$ (J–K) + 14
NGC 6656 (M22)	−200 km s^{-1} < RV < −120 km s^{-1}; [Fe/H] < −1.25 dex; SNR > 21; AlgoConv = 0

observational errors nor large chemical differences with respect to other Milky Way GCs (e.g. Gonzalez & Wallerstein 1998; Carretta et al. 2009; Muñoz et al. 2013, although see Simmerer et al. 2013). Therefore, its origin appears to be similar to "normal" GCs, i.e., with signs of multiple populations, but without signs of supernova enrichment.

Figure 1 (left) shows the spatial location of NGC 3201 within the RAVE footprint. A 5 degree field of view centered on the cluster is shown. We search for cluster members based solely on the radial velocity information provided by RAVE. A radial velocity range of ±15 km s^{-1} is searched, as this velocity range encompasses almost all stars in the extensive NGC 3201 radial velocity catalogue of Côté et al. (1994, 1995). Out of the 4390 RAVE stars within a 12 degree area of the sky, 16 have a radial velocities consistent with cluster membership (i.e., radial velocities between 480 km s^{-1} and 510 km s^{-1}). Most of these stars stars fall within the tidal radius of the cluster, but two do not (see Figure 1). These possible extra-tidal stars are given in Table 3, where the columns list (1) the RAVE ID, (2) the right ascension in degrees (epoch J2000), (3) the declination in degrees, (4) the line of sight radial velocity in km s^{-1}, (5) the RAVE radial velocity uncertainty in km s^{-1}, (6) the RAVE [Fe/H], (7) the RAVE [Si/Fe], (8) the RAVE [Mg/Fe], (9) the 2MASS J-magnitude, (10) the 2MASS K-magnitude, and (11) the distance from the cluster center in degrees. Increasing the area of the sky to cover 20 degrees of the RAVE footprint increases the number of RAVE stars sampled to 8495, but no additional stars with velocities of ∼494 km s^{-1} are detected. In general, the stars with velocities of ∼494 km s^{-1} also have colors and magnitudes that place them on the giant branch of NGC 3201, further indicating their association with the cluster. The RAVE stellar parameters are consistent with these stars being giant stars, as they all fall within the temperature and gravity range of 4000 K < T_{eff} < 7000 K and log g < 3.5 (cgs), clearly separating them from e.g., nearby dwarf stars.

Six of the NGC 3201 stars have metallicities derived from the RAVE chemical abundance pipeline and are shown in Figure 1 (right). Given the external errors (∼0.23 dex) in the RAVE [Fe/H] metallicities as discussed previously, we do not wish to place too much emphasis on the metallicites to characterize the potential extra-tidal stars. However, it is worth stressing that the low metallicities of these stars set them apart from the majority of the RAVE stars and confirm their halo membership. Moreover, three of these stars have spectra for which elemental abundances can be determined, all of which show enhanced [Si/Fe] and [Mg/Fe] values, in good agreement with high-resolution spectroscopy of NGC 3201 from Carretta et al. (2009) and Muñoz et al. (2013).

2.2. NGC 1851

It is traditionally considered that "normal" GCs are those that exhibit the following properties: (i) their stars appear to have the same [Fe/H]; (ii) their stars are chemically homogeneous in the heavy elements; and (iii) their stars are chemically inhomogeneous in the light element abundances, e.g., variations in the CH, CN, NH bands, and in the O, Na, Al, and Mg abundances. Nearly all GCs have these characteristics. NGC 1851 is one of few GCs that show a spread in the heavier elements and [Fe/H] (rms scatter ∼0.05 dex in [Fe/H], which is larger than the observational errors; Carretta et al. 2011). This is a characteristic that is seen only in a small number of other systems[1]. The presence of heavy element abundance ranges in these systems necessarily means their nucleosynthetic history must be more complicated than for "normal" GCs, although the exact cause remains unclear. However, the chemical analogies with the cluster systems ω Centauri and M 54, usually believed to be associated with the remnants of a dwarf galaxy cannibalized by the Milky Way, suggest the intriguing idea that all of the clusters with [Fe/H] metallicity spreads could be surviving nuclei of more massive systems. NGC 1851 is therefore a strong candidate to search for extra-tidal stars.

NGC 1851 further has a split sub-giant branch (Milone et al. 2008), a split RGB when particular filters are used (Han et al. 2009) and spectroscopic observations have revealed a bimodality in s-process abundances (Yong & Grundahl 2008; Villanova et al. 2010; Gratton et al. 2012b).

Figure 2 shows the spatial location of NGC 1851 within the RAVE survey. The central velocity dispersion is twice as large for this cluster as compared to NGC 3201 (Harris 1996), so a wider range in radial velocity is searched. We further only consider stars as potential cluster members if their magnitudes and colors are within that of the cluster (see Table 2). Here we allow for a ∼2 kpc distance spread in the CMD, which encompasses ∼95% of the stars in our N-body simulation of the cluster orbiting the MW for one Gyr on the most likely orbit (see §3.2 for details). This also encompasses the uncertainties in the 2MASS magnitudes, which can reach up to ∼0.17 mag in K for the stars in the cluster core (see Table 4).

Out of the 8,948 RAVE stars surveyed in a 20 degree field around NGC 1851, eleven have radial velocities, colors and mag-

[1] The other GCs distinguishable from normal GCs as evidenced by their spread in [Fe/H] are ω Centauri (Lee et al. 1999; Bedin et al. 2004), M 54 (Layden & Sarajedini 1997; Siegel et al. 2007), Terzan 5 (Ferraro et al. 2009), M 22 (Norris & Freeman 1983; Da Costa et al. 2009; Marino et al. 2009, 2011) and NGC 2419 (Cohen et al. 2010; Di Criscienzo et al. 2011).



Fig. 1. *Left:* The CMD (top-right), and radial velocity distribution (top-left) of the RAVE stars in a 12 degree field centered on NGC 3201. The spatial distribution of the RAVE stars in a 5 degree field centered on the cluster is shown (bottom), and the King tidal radius of the cluster is shown by the large circle. The crosses (red in online version) show the RAVE stars whereas the triangles (blue in the online version) show the NGC 3201 stars studied by Côté et al. (1994). The circled RAVE stars are those for which a chemical analysis could be carried out. *Right:* The [Fe/H], [Si/Fe] and [Mg/Fe] ratio of a sub-sample of these same stars for which abundances could be determined. The triangles (green in the online version) are the parameters of the NGC 3201 red giant stars obtained from intermediate-resolution spectra by Carretta et al. (2009) and high-resolution spectra by Muñoz et al. (2013).

nitudes consistent with that of the cluster, and these stars are listed in Table 4. Most of these stars lie outside the tidal radius of the cluster. The two RAVE stars located within the tidal radius of the cluster almost certainly are cluster members, and the nine RAVE stars which also align along the AGB and RGB of NGC 1851 are plausible cluster members, as they have properties consistent with not only the cluster's radial velocity, but also its distance. Further, for the RAVE stars with a SNR greater than 40, the RAVE temperatures and gravities are in good agreement with the stars being giant branch stars of NGC 1851.

Figure 2 (right) shows the derived [Fe/H] abundances for the four RAVE stars with spectra suitable for abundance determination. Although the rms spread in [Fe/H] as determined for this cluster from high-resolution spectra is ∼0.05 dex (Carretta et al. 2011), the individual errors in the RAVE metallicity values (∼0.23 dex) are considerably larger than this, and so it is not surprising that the [Fe/H] values show a broader spread. Within the errors, all the four stars with radial velocities consistent with that of NGC 1851 also have [Fe/H] metallicities in agreement with the [Fe/H] of the cluster and are significantly more metal-poor then the majority of the field population seen in projection along that line of sight in this area of the sky. One of these stars also has an estimate of [Si/H], and [Mg/H], which is consistent within its uncertainty with those of the cluster.

2.3. NGC 6656 – M22

M 22, like NGC 1851, is another one of the six GCs known to host groups of stars with different iron [Fe/H] and heavy element contents. The stellar rms scatter is [Fe/H]∼0.15 dex and variations in its elements associated with *s*-process elements are also present (Norris & Freeman 1983; Da Costa et al. 2009; Marino et al. 2009, 2011). This direct evidence for extended star formation suggests this cluster may have an extra-galactic origin and hence a tidal tail. The CMD of M 22 shows a double sub-giant branch (Marino et al. 2012) as well as two discrete distributions of RGBs, each having a different Ca abundance as observed from the *hk* index of the *Ca-by* photometry (Lee et al. 2009).

RAVE avoided probing close to the Galactic plane, so the number of RAVE stars is not as dense in this region of the sky as e.g., NGC 1851. Figure 3 shows the spatial location of the globular cluster M22, with the 2162 RAVE stars in a 35 degree field of view. Because this cluster does not have as extreme a velocity as for NGC 1851 and NGC 3201, the RAVE stars are restricted to only those which also have reliable abundance determinations, as indicated by sufficient SNR and an AlgoConv value that indicates that the DR4 pipeline converged (see Kordopatis et al. 2013, for further details). Because the stars in M22 do not have a homogenous distribution of [Fe/H], but have been shown to range from −1.25 to −2.4 dex (e.g. Gratton et al. 2014), our [Fe/H] search criteria cover all RAVE stars more metal poor than −1.25 dex. Figure 3 (bottom, left panel) shows the range of [Fe/H] and radial velocity observed for stars in M22, which guided our search criteria for potential extra-tidal stars belonging to this cluster. The exact criteria are explicitly listed in Table 2.

One of these stars has a radial velocity and metallicity consistent with that of M22, and is located at a projected distance ∼10 degrees from the cluster center. It also has a color and magnitude that places it on the giant branch of M22, as well as [Ti/Fe], [Mg/Fe] and [Si/Fe] values consistent with those of the cluster.

3. Discussion

A cluster's tidal radius is normally estimated by fitting King (1966) models to cluster density profiles. However, the assump-



Fig. 2. *Left:* The spatial distribution (bottom), CMD (top-right), and radial velocity distribution of the RAVE stars in a 20 degree field centered on NGC 1851. The crosses (red in the online version) show the RAVE stars whereas the triangles (blue in the online version) show the NGC 1851 stars from Milone et al. (2009) and Carretta et al. (2011). The circled RAVE stars are those for which a chemical analysis could be carried out. In the bottom panel we also show the expected angular distribution of tidal debris stars (black dots) as predicted by an *N*-body simulation of the cluster orbiting the MW for one Gyr on the most likely orbit (see §3.2 for details). *Right:* The [Fe/H], [Si/Fe] and [Mg/Fe] ratio of a sub-sample of these same stars for which abundances could be determined. The triangles (green in the online version) are the parameters of the NGC 1851 red giant stars obtained from intermediate-resolution spectra by Carretta et al. (2011) and Carretta et al. (2012).

Table 3. RAVE NGC 3201 Extra-Tidal Stars

RAVE ID	RA (J2000)	Dec (J2000)	V_{LOS} (km s^{-1})	σ_V (km s^{-1})	[Fe/H] (dex)	[Si/Fe] (dex)	[Mg/Fe] (dex)	J (mag)	K (mag)	r (degrees)
20110520_1023m47_056	153.5235	−46.4779	495	1	−1.41	0.05	0.32	10.01±0.02	9.17±0.02	0.88
20090404_1023m47_058	155.1078	−46.7349	497	1	−1.24	–	–	8.41±0.03	7.40±0.02	0.78

Table 4. RAVE NGC 1851 Stars

RAVE ID	RA (J2000)	Dec (J2000)	V_{LOS} (km s^{-1})	σ_V (km s^{-1})	[Fe/H] (dex)	[Si/Fe] (dex)	[Mg/Fe] (dex)	J (mag)	K (mag)	r (degrees)
20051110_0449m41_116[b]	74.3136	−41.0417	308	2	–	–	–	10.63±0.02	9.65±0.02	4.33
20081017_0449m41_116[b]	74.3136	−41.0417	305	1	–	–	–	10.63±0.02	9.65±0.02	4.33
20100124_0501m36_070	75.1000	−35.3876	354	1	–	–	–	9.44±0.03	8.42±0.02	5.78
20111020_0505m41_122	77.0456	−42.6795	359	1	–	–	–	9.36±0.02	8.34±0.02	3.02
20111020_0505m41_095[a]	78.5297	−40.0491	318	1	−1.29	–	–	11.57±0.09	10.65±0.11	0.0030
20061120_0505m41_094[a]	78.5285	−40.0457	323	1	–	–	–	9.64±0.38	8.82±0.17	0.0009
20120107_0532m42_060	80.7067	−44.3188	375	2	−1.41	–	–	9.56±0.02	8.74±0.02	4.80
20070206_0536m47_056[b]	82.0560	−46.2541	343	1	−1.44	–	–	10.08±0.02	9.24±0.03	7.14
20041101_0523m48_083[b]	82.0560	−46.2541	341	2	–	–	–	10.08±0.02	9.24±0.03	7.14
20050331_0555m46_021	86.0893	−47.7149	321	7	–	–	–	11.13±0.02	10.42±0.02	10.77
20040209_0555m46_063	86.9080	−44.1528	316	4	–	–	–	11.18±0.02	10.57±0.02	9.33
20050221_0549m40_146	88.0446	−42.8051	311	1	–	–	–	11.30±0.02	10.54±0.02	9.91
20120122_0558m41_132	88.3831	−40.4547	316	1	−0.98	0.47	0.16	10.89±0.02	10.09±0.02	9.86

[a] within tidal radius
[b] star observed twice by RAVE

tion of the King edge radius as a real physical limit of the cluster is not set in stone. For example, McLaughlin & van der Marel (2005) investigate the stellar distributions of GCs in not only the Galaxy, but also the Magellanic Clouds and the Fornax dwarf spheroidal galaxy, and find that Wilson (1975) models, originally developed for application to elliptical galaxies, better describe the outer structures than do King models. More recent investigations capitalizing on wide-field imagers confirms this result (e.g., Di Cecco et al. 2013).

Also, Zocchi et al. (2012) show with their sample of 13 GCs, that kinematic fits are crucial to assess if a model is actually suited to describe a given globular cluster. Unfortunately, there is a general lack of good kinematic data, generally consisting of a small number of data-points and not well distributed in radius. The case for NGC 3201 is encouraging in that Côté et al. (1995) obtained 857 radial velocities with median precision ∼1 km s^{-1} for 399 member giants to trace the velocity dispersion profile of this cluster out to 32'.1. This has allowed nonparametric modelling of this cluster, and it was found that NGC 3201 has significantly more stars which are tightly bound (low energy) than King models predict (Gebhardt & Fischer 1995).

3.1. NGC 3201

For NGC 3201, the tidal radius from the Wilson model is about twice as large as from the King model (see Table 1). The two RAVE extra-tidal stars are located 0.78° and 0.88° away in projection from the cluster center, well beyond the 0.47° King tidal



Fig. 3. *Left:* The spatial distribution (top-left), CMD (top-right), and radial velocity vs [Fe/H] distribution of the RAVE stars in a 35 degree field centered on NGC 1851. The cluster center of M22 is indicated by an open (blue) circle. The [Fe/H], radial velocity, colors and magnitudes of the red giant branch stars of M22 shown as triangles (blue in the online version) are taken from Marino et al. (2009), Da Costa et al. (2009), Alves-Brito et al. (2012) and Gratton et al. (2014). *Right:* The [Si/Fe], [Mg/Fe] and [Ti/Fe] ratio of the same stars. The triangles (green in the online version) are elemental abundances of M22 horizontal branch stars obtained from intermediate-resolution spectra by Gratton et al. (2014).

Table 5. RAVE NGC 6656 Extra-Tidal Stars

RAVE ID	RA (J2000)	Dec (J2000)	V_{LOS} (km s^{-1})	σ_V (km s^{-1})	[Fe/H] (dex)	[Si/Fe] (dex)	[Ti/Fe] (dex)	[Al/Fe] (dex)	[Mg/Fe] (dex)	J (mag)	K (mag)
20110824_1915m27_053	287.3046	−26.0189	−128	1	−1.28	0.00	0.60	0.26	0.62	10.21±0.02	9.32±0.03

radius of the cluster (Harris 1996, 2010 edition). Hence, either our results extend the velocity dispersion profile of this cluster out to ∼0.9°, inline with the Gebhardt & Fischer (1995) findings and a Wilson tidal radius, or these RAVE stars are unbound and are therefore not part of the cluster's tidal radius. It is worth noting that NGC 3201 is thought to have experienced a recent impact with the Galactic disk (Vande Putte & Cropper 2009), and this crossing could show stellar debris structure observed as clumpy structures (e.g., Chen & Chen 2010). The extra-tidal RAVE stars may also be associated with just recently experienced disk-crossing shocks.

Curiously, despite the relatively rich number of RAVE cluster members found within the cluster tidal radius of NGC 3201, further than 0.9°, not one RAVE star with a radial velocity within 490 km s^{-1} and 500 km s^{-1} is found when searching 64,206 RAVE stars within a 30° radius of the cluster center (between the right ascension of 124.5° and 184.5° and the declination of −76.5° and −16.5°). This suggests that if NGC 3201 has an extra-galactic origin, no prominent, large-scale stellar debris consistient with radial velocities between 490 km s^{-1} – 500 km s^{-1} exists, such as would be perhaps expected if it were a satellite galaxy merging with the Milky Way. However, Côté et al. (1995) found a difference in the radial velocity of 1.22±0.25 km s^{-1} for stars on either side of the cluster, and although this could be interpreted as the cluster having internal rotation, it could also be that the radial velocity of the stellar population associated with NGC 3201 has a radial velocity gradient. There is one RAVE star outside the tidal radius of NGC 3201 with a radial velocity between 470 km s^{-1} – 490 km s^{-1} and five RAVE stars with radial velocities between 500 km s^{-1} – 520 km s^{-1}, all located more than 20° away from the cluster center. Therefore, the RAVE radial velocity data suggest that any potential tidal stream surrounding NGC 3201 is a weak feature. If this GC was accreted by the Milky Way much earlier, any debris could be quite diffuse and dynamically hot (e.g., Bullock & Johnston 2005; Font et al. 2008). Detailed dynamical modelling of this cluster could address this further.

3.2. NGC 1851

There is increasing speculation that NGC 1851 is the result of a merger of two GCs that were both formed in a dwarf spheroidal galaxy, dragged to the center of the dSph by dynamical friction, and that now this dwarf spheroidal is being destroyed by Galactic tidal forces (e.g., van den Bergh 1996; Carretta et al. 2010). NGC 1851 has an unusually high central concentration of light, which can be explained if it was formed by the merging of two initially spherical star clusters (e.g., White 1978). Each cluster might have formed with a slightly different metallicity and with a different level of αelements, which would explain that the stars in NGC 1851 can be divided into two groups according to their metallicity, where *both* components show a moderate Na-O anticorrelation (Carretta et al. 2010). Since the Na-O (and the C-N) anticorrelations alone can be considered as the signature of multiple stellar populations, the two stellar groups in NGC 1851 appear to both exhibit the product of multiple stellar formation episodes.

That NGC 1851 was once part of a larger system, such as a dwarf spheroidal galaxy, is supported by its unexpected dispersion in *heavy* element abundances, which suggests enrichment by supernovae (Lee et al. 2009; Han et al. 2009). It is hard to understand how a GC with little or no dark matter and low binding energy could retain energetic SNe ejecta, unless the GC we observe today were a remnant of an initially much more massive stellar system.

Further, a diffuse stellar halo with a size of more than 500 pc and a mass of ∼ 0.1 per cent of the dynamical mass of NGC 1851 has been observed by Olszewski et al. (2009), and this peculiar feature can be explained by its formation in the central region of a defunct host dwarf galaxy (Bekki & Yong 2012). The different density distributions of metal-poor and metal-rich stars suggests that if NGC 1851 was formed from the merging of two clusters, this can not have occurred too long in the past (i.e, less than a few Gyr ago). This merging should have happened before the putative dwarf spheroidal dissolved, so it should still be possible to identify the remains of this ancestral, parent galaxy.

Given the state of published models, it is not possible to easily determine if the extra-tidal stars detected in RAVE are following the cluster's orbit, as is the case with Pal 5 and NGC 5466. The RAVE observations of candidate extra-tidal stars are also limited spatially, and we therefore can not trace out discrete structures in common with photographic counts in e.g., studies that find extensions of the cluster (Leon et al. 2000) or studies that show a smooth extended halo structure (Olszewski et al. 2009). It is, however, noteworthy that the extra-tidal candidate stars have a preferential direction towards a S-E extension, similar to the tails observed around NGC 1851 from Leon et al. (2000), see their Figure 10.

To obtain some intuition about where we should expect to find stars that were stripped off the cluster, we performed a simple (collisionless) *N*-body experiment[2]. We set-up a King model with the structural properties of NGC 1851 as reported by Harris (1996) on an orbit around the Milky Way that would lead the cluster after ∼1 Gyr to its present position and kinematics (taken from Harris 1996 and Dinescu et al. 1997). For the Galactic gravitational potential we use the mass model proposed by McMillan (2011). The resulting final angular positions of star particles are also shown in Figure 2. As we start with the current structure of the cluster, which is then tidally stripped along its orbit, the final cluster in our model has slightly different properties than NGC 1851, but the simulation is still effective to identify the rough location where the tidal debris would be observed.

The correlation between our NGC 1851 orbit and the candidate NGC 1851 extra-tidal RAVE stars is encouraging, and indicates a low probability that the majority of these stars are due to random fluctuations in the field. With suitable follow-up observations, they could be used as probes of a debris stream associated with NGC 1851.

Recently, a spectroscopic survey performed in the outskirts of NGC 1851 by Sollima et al. (2012) resulted in tentative evidence of a cold peak in the distribution of radial velocities at ∼180 km s^{-1}. These stars had a location in the color-magnitude diagram compatible with a stream at a similar distance to this cluster, and if confirmed, would constitute a strong indication of the presence of a stream in the direction of NGC 1851. Therefore, we searched for an excess of RAVE stars with velocities of ∼180 km s^{-1} within 5 degrees of the cluster. Only one star with a radial velocity between 170 km s^{-1} and 190 km s^{-1} was identified with a similar location in the color-magnitude diagram as NGC 1851, located ∼4.5° from the cluster center. Hence, the RAVE data are not able to confirm a 180 km s^{-1} stream in the direction of NGC 1851, although given that the Sollima et al. (2012) feature was constituted mainly by main-sequence stars and the RAVE stars would only be able to probe the RGB and AGB stars, this is perhaps not surprising.

3.3. NGC 6656 – M22

As discussed previously, the abundance spread in heavy elements in the stars of M22 have caused much speculation that this cluster was previously a stellar nucleus formed in situ or through merging of two GCs with different chemical abundances. Despite being located in relatively close proximity to the Sun, $R_\odot$ = 3.2 kpc, studies of this cluster are hampered by its location toward the crowded and heavily extincted Galactic bulge, making it difficult to disentangle cluster parameters, due to e.g., contamination from field stars and differential reddening (Monaco et al. 2004; Kunder et al. 2013).

The RAVE stars are limited in the direction of M22, yet we find a candidate extra-tidal star associated with M22 based on [Fe/H] metallicity, elemental-abundances and radial velocity, as well as its position on the RGB of M22. Similarly, within the ARGOS spectroscopic survey of the red clump stars of the Galactic bulge, Ness et al. (2013) find 11 stars with [Fe/H] abundances and radial velocities consistent with the GC M22. They find a mean distance spread of 1.8 kpc and speculate that this distance spread is due in part to extended tidal streams associated with M22. Unfortunately due to the unavailability of the ARGOS data and extremely limited data tables, we are unable to assess where these stars are spatially distributed and hence how far they are from the cluster center. The relative success of RAVE and ARGOS to kinematically select M22 stars beyond its tidal radius suggests that a systematic spectroscopic search for M22 extra-tidal stars would likely yield interesting results and perhaps a large enough sample to investigate the geometry of potential tidal tails associated with this cluster.

3.4. Comments Regarding Omega Cen

The globular cluster ω Centauri (NGC 5129) is the largest globular cluster known in the Milky Way galaxy with a radial velocity of ∼231 km s^{-1} and a large central velocity dispersion of ∼17 km s^{-1} (Harris 1996). The stars within this cluster show an unusually large star-to-star spread in iron that spans more than an order of magnitude, from $-2.2 <$ [Fe/H] < -0.7 (e.g., Johnson & Pilachowski 2010). As already mentioned in the introduction, there has been evidence presented that this GC is the former nucleus of a dwarf galaxy (e.g., Lee et al. 1999; Bekki & Freeman 2003; Majewski et al. 2012).

It is worth noting that there is a clear group of 14 stars with radial velocities ∼220-280 km s^{-1} as seen in the top, left panel of Figure 1, and a group of 11 stars with radial velocities ∼220-280 km s^{-1} in the top, left panel of Figure 2. The majority of these stars for which abundance determinations could be determined are also relatively metal-poor, as shown in the top, right panel of the same figures. These features are consistent with stars from the massive globular cluster ω Cen, which has been shown to have a significant kinematically coherent "tidal debris" signature spanning >60° of Galactic longitude in the Grid Giant Star Survey (GGSS) radial velocity survey of giant stars located

[2] The *N*-body integration was done using the code gyrfalcON (Dehnen 2002) which is publicly available in the *N*-body code frame work NEMO by Teuben (1995).

within ~5 kpc of the Sun (Majewski et al. 2012). This ω Cen signature is especially prominent at l~285° (Majewski et al. 2012), and coincidentally, NGC 3201 is located at l~277° and NGC 1851 is located at l~244°. Our radial velocity histograms covering the large areas surrounding NGC 1851 and NGC 3201 therefore agree with the result from Majewski et al. (2012), that extended parts of the ω Cen tidal stream are contributing to giant stars in the inner Galaxy. It is also in agreement with the study of Wylie-de Boer et al. (2010), who find that a number of members of the Kapteyn group of nearby halo stars are probably remnants of tidal debris stripped from the parent galaxy of ω Cen, or from the cluster itself, during its merger with the Galaxy.

4. Conclusions

Stars selected from the extensive RAVE survey that can be associated with the GCs M22, NGC 1851 and NGC 3201 are presented, some reaching outside the King (1966) tidal radius of these clusters. For the kinematically peculiar cluster NGC 3201, we find cluster member stars extending few arc minutes from the edge of the cluster's radius and no further extra-tidal stars associated with NGC 3201. Given the relatively rich number of RAVE cluster members found within the cluster tidal radius of NGC 3201, the RAVE radial velocity data suggests that any potential tidal stream surrounding NGC 3201 would be a weak feature.

For M22 and NGC 1851, two GCs with groups of stars with different *s*-element content, each group exhibiting their own Na-O, C-N anticorrelations, we find RAVE stars with radial velocities, [Fe/H] abundances, elemental-abundances and positions on the CMD consistent with that of the cluster, but located at projected distances of ~10 degrees from the cluster center. Although the stellar proper motion errors of these stars are too large to use as an inclusion criteria, the UCAC4 proper motions are consistent with the small mean absolute proper motions of the corresponding clusters taking into account the errors. We conclude that these stars are promising extra-tidal candidates, suggesting an extra-galactic origin for these clusters.

Since the tidal tails of globular clusters are preferentially formed by the lowest-mass stars (e.g. Combes et al. 1999; Koch et al. 2004), it is challenging to study tidal tails of globular clusters using only bright stars. Therefore, it is difficult to use the RAVE results presented here to comment on specifics of accreted GCs in the Milky Way, although if these extra-tidal stars are shown to be extended structures originating from the GC, then this provides spectroscopic evidence that accretion onto the early MW was significant, as predicted in the seminal work of Searle & Zinn (1978). Following up with deep CCD studies in the location of the sky of these extra-tidal stars to search for the cluster's main-sequence, as in e.g., Carballo-Bello & Martinez-Delgado (2010), would be a promising next step to confirm the association of these RAVE stars with the remnants of an accreted dwarf galaxy in the disk of the Milky Way.

5. Acknowledgments

The authors thank the reviewer for her/his useful comments that helped improve and clarify this manuscript. This work was partially supported by PRIN–INAF 2011 "Tracing the formation and evolution of the Galactic halo with VST" (P.I.: M. Marconi) and by PRIN–MIUR (2010LY5N2T) "Chemical and dynamical evolution of the Milky Way and Local Group galaxies" (P.I.: F. Matteucci). Funding for RAVE has been provided by: the Australian Astronomical Observatory; the Leibniz-Institut fuer Astrophysik Potsdam (AIP); the Australian National University; the Australian Research Council; the French National Research Agency; the German Research Foundation (SPP 1177 and SFB 881); the European Research Council (ERC-StG 240271 Galactica); the Istituto Nazionale di Astrofisica at Padova; The Johns Hopkins University; the National Science Foundation of the USA (AST-0908326); the W. M. Keck foundation; the Macquarie University; the Netherlands Research School for Astronomy; the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada; the Slovenian Research Agency; the Swiss National Science Foundation; the Science & Technology Facilities Council of the UK; Opticon; Strasbourg Observatory; and the Universities of Groningen, Heidelberg and Sydney. The RAVE web site is at http://www.rave-survey.org

References

Abadi M. G., Navarro J. F., & Steinmetz M., 2006, MNRAS, 365, 747
Alves-Brito, A., Yong, D., Meléndez, J., Vásquez, S., Karakas, A. I. 2012, A&A, 540, 3
Bedin, L. R., Piotto, G., & Anderson, J. et al. 2004, ApJ, 605, L125
Belokurov, V., Evans, N. W., Irwin, M. J., Hewett, P. C. & Wilkinson, M. I. 2006, ApJ, 637, 29
Bekki, K. & Freeman, K. C. 2003, MNRAS, 346, 11
Bekki, K. & Yong, D. 2012, MNRAS, 419, 2063
Binney, J., & Merrifield, M. 1998, Galactic Astronomy (Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press), 307
Binney, J., Burnett, B., Kordopatis, G. et al. 2014, MNRAS, 439, 1231
Boeche, C., Siebert, A., Williams, M. et al. 2011, AJ, 142, 193
Bullock, J.S. & Johnston, K.V. 2005, ApJ, 635, 931
Carballo-Bello, J.A. & Martinez-Delgado, D. 2010, in Diego J. M., Goicoechea L. J., González-Serrano J. I., Gorgas J., eds, Highlights of Spanish Astrophysics V. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, p. 383
Carretta, E., Bragaglia, A., Gratton, R., & Lucatello, S. 2009, A&A, 505, 139
Carretta E. et al., 2010, ApJ, 722, 1
Carretta E. et al., 2011, A&A, 533, 69
Carretta E. et al., 2012, A&A, 543, 117
Chen, C.W. & Chen, W.P., 2010, ApJ, 721, 1790
Crnojević D., Grebel E. K., Koch A., 2010, A&A, 516, 85
Cohen, J. G., Kirby, E. N., Simon, J. D., & Geha, M. 2010, ApJ, 725, 288
Combes, F., Leon, S., & Meylan, G. 1999, A&A, 352, 149
Côté, P., Welch, D.L., Fischer, P., Da Costa, G. S., Tamblyn, P., Seitzer, P. & Irwin, M. J. 1994, ApJS, 90, 83
Côté, P., Welch, D.L., Fischer, P. & Gebhardt, K. 1995, ApJ, 454, 788
Da Costa, G.S. & Armandroff, T. E. 1995, AJ, 109, 2533
Da Costa, G.S., Held, E.V., Saviane, I. & Gullieuszik, M. 2009, ApJ, 705, 1481
Dehnen, W. 2002, ASPC, 275, 105
Di Cecco, A. Zocchi, A., Varrie, A.L. et al. 2013, AJ, 145, 103
Di Criscienzo, M., D'Antona, F., & Milone, A. P. et al. 2011, MNRAS, 414, 3381
Dinescu, D.I., Girard, T. M., van Altena, W. F., Méndez, R., & López, C. E. 1997, AJ, 114, 1014
Ferraro, F. R., Dalessandro, E., & Mucciarelli, A. et al. 2009, Nature, 462, 483
Font, A.S., Johnston, K.V., Ferguson, A.M.N. et al. 2008, ApJ, 673, 215
Forbes, D.A. & Bridges, T. 2010, MNRAS, 404, 1203
Freeman K. C. 1993, in Smith G., Brodie J., eds, ASP Conf. Ser. Vol. 48, The Globular Clusters-Galaxy Connection. Astron. Soc. Pac., San Francisco, p. 608
Freeman, K. C. & Rodgers, A. W. 1975, ApJ, 201 71
Gebhardt, K. & Fischer, P. 1995, AJ, 109, 290
Geyer, M. P., & Burkert, A. 2001, MNRAS, 323, 988
Gierz, M. & Heggie, D.C. 1997, MNRAS, 286, 709
Gnedin, O. Y. & Ostriker, J. P. 1997, ApJ, 474, 223
Gonzalez, G., & Wallerstein, G. 1998, AJ, 116, 765
Gratton, R.G., Sneden, C., & Carretta, E. 2004, ARA&A, 42, 385
Gratton, R.G., Carretta, E., Bragaglia, A. 2012a, A&ARv, 20, 50
Gratton, R.G., Villanova, S., Lucatello, S. et al. 2012b, A&A, 544, 12
Gratton, R. G., Lucatello, S., Carretta, E. et al. 2012,c A&A, 539, 19
Gratton, R.G., Lucatello, S., Sollima, A. et al. A&A, 563, 13
Grillmair C. J., Freeman K. G., Irwin M. & Quinn P. J. 1995, AJ, 109, 2553
Grillmair C. J., Ajhar E. A., Faber S. M., Baum W. A., Holtzman J. A., Lauer T. R. 1996, AJ, 111, 2293
Grillmair C. J., & Dionatos O. 2006, ApJ, 641, 37
Grillmair C. J., & Johnson, R. 2006, ApJ, 639, 17

Grillmair C. J. 2009, ApJ, 693, 1118
Grillmair C. J. 2011, ApJ, 738, 98
Grillmair C. J., Cutri, R., Masci, F.J. et al. 2013, ApJ, 769, 23
Groenewegen, M. A. T., Udalski, A. & Bono, G. 2008, A&A, 81, 441
Harris, W. E. 1996, AJ, 112, 1487
Han, S.-I., Lee, Y.-W., & Joo, S.-J. et al. 2009, ApJ, 707, L190
Holland S., Fahlman G. G. & Richer H. B. 1997, AJ, 114, 1488
Johnson, C.I. & Pilachowski, C. A. 2010, ApJ, 722, 1373
Jordi, K. & Grebel, E. K. 2010, A&A, 522, 71
King, I. R. 1966, AJ, 71, 64
Koch, A., Grebel, E. K., Odenkirchen, M., Martínez-Delgado, D., Caldwell, J. A. R. 2004, AJ, 128, 2274
Kordopatis, G., Gilmore, G., Steinmetz, M. et al. 2013, AJ, 146, 134
Kroupa, P. 2001, MNRAS, 322, 231
Kunder, A., Stetson, P.B., Cassisi, S. et al. 2013, AJ, 146, 119
Layden, A. C. & Sarajedini, A. 1997, ApJ, 486, L107
Layden, A. C. & Sarajedini, A. 2000, AJ, 119, 1760
Leaman, R., VandenBerg, D.A. & Mendel, J.T. 2013, MNRAS, 436, 122
Lee, Y.-W., Joo, J.-M., & Sohn, Y.-J. et al. 1999, Nature, 402, 55
Lee K. H., Lee H. M., Fahlman G. G. & Lee M. G. 2003, AJ, 126, 815
Lee K. H., Lee H. M., Fahlman G. G., & Sung H. 2004, AJ, 128, 2838
Lee, J-W., Lee, J., Kang, Y-W., Lee, Y-W., Han, S-I., Joo, S-J., Rey, S-C., Yong, D. 2009, ApJ, 695, L78
Lehmann I. & Scholz R.-D. 1997, A&A, 320, 776
Leon S., Bergond G. & Vallenari A. 1999, A&A, 344, 450
Leon S., Meylan G. & Combes F. 2000, A&A, 359, 907
Mackey A. D. & Gilmore G. F., 2004, MNRAS, 355, 504
Majewski, S.R., Nidever, D.L., Smith, V.V. et al. 2012, ApJ, 747, 37
Marín-Franch, A., et al. ApJ, 2009 694, 1498
Marino, A. F., Milone, A. P., Piotto, G., Villanova, S., Bedin, L. R., Bellini, A. & Renzini, A. 2009, A&A, 505, 1099
Marino, A. F., Sneden, C., & Kraft, R. P. et al. 2011, A&A, 532, 8
Marino, A. F., Milone, A. P., Sneden, C. et al. 2012, A&A, 541, 15
Martell, S. L., & Grebel, E. K. 2010, A&A, 519, 14
Martell, S. L., Smolinski, J. P., Beers, T. C. & Grebel, E. K. 2011, A&A, 534, 136
Matsunaga, N. et al. 2009, MNRAS, 399, 1709
McLaughlin, D.E. & van der Marel, R.P. 2005, ApJS, 161, 304
McMillan, P.J. 2011, MNRAS, 414, 2446
Meylan, G. & Heggie, D.C. 1996, A&ARv, 8, 1
Milone, A. P., et al. 2012, ApJ, 673, 241
Milone, A. P., Stetson, P.B., Piotto, G. et al. 2012, A&A, 503, 755
Milone, A. P., et al. 2008, ApJ, 744, 58
Monaco, L., Pancino, E., Ferraro, F.R. & Bellazzini, M. 2004, MNRAS, 349, 1278
Montuori, M., Capuzzo-Dolcetta, R., Di Matteo, P., Lepinette, A. & Miocchi, P. 2007, ApJ, 659, 1212
Munari, U., Siviero, A., Bienayme, O., et al. 2009, A&A, 503, 511
Muñoz, C., Geisler, D. & Villanova, S. 2013, MNRAS, 433, 2006
Murali, C. & Dubinski, J. 1999, AJ, 118, 911
Ness, M., Freeman, K., Athanassoula, E. et al. 2013, MNRAS, 430, 936
Norris, J., & Freeman, K. C. 1983, ApJ, 266, 130
Olszewski E. W., Saha A., Knezek P., Subramaniam A., de Boer T., Seitzer P. 2009, AJ, 138, 1570
Odenkirchen M., et al, 2001, ApJ, 548, 165
Odenkirchen M., Grebel, E. K., & Dehnen, W. et al. 2003, AJ, 126, 2385
Odenkirchen M., Grebel, E. K., Kayser, A., Rix, H.-W., & Dehnen, W. 2009, AJ, 137, 3378
Peñarrubia, J., Walker M. G. & Gilmore G., 2009, MNRAS, 399, 1275
Richer, H.B., Heyl, J., Anderson, J., Kalirai, J.S., Shara, M.M., Dotter, A., Fahlman, G.G. & Rich, R.M. 2013, ApJ, 771, 15
Rodgers, A. W., & Paltoglou, G. 1984, ApJ, 283, L5
Romano, D., Matteucci, F., Tosi, M. et al. 2006, MNRAS, 376, 405
Salaris, M. & Weiss, A. 2002, A&A, 388, 492
Sarajedini, A. & Layden, A.C. 1995, 109, 1086
Searle, L. & Zinn, R. 1978, ApJ, 225, 357
Siegel, M. H., Dotter, A., & Majewski, S. R. et al. 2007, ApJ, 667, L57
Simmerer, J., Ivans, I. I., Filler, D., et al. 2013, ApJ, 764, 7
Sohn Y.-J., et al. 2003, AJ, 126, 803
Sollima, A., Gratton, R. G., Carballo-Bello, J. A., Martínez-Delgado, D., Carretta, E., Bragaglia, A., Lucatello, S. & Peñarrubia, J. 2012, MNRAS, 426, 1137
Steinmetz, M., Zwitter, T., Siebert, A., et al. 2006, AJ, 132, 1645
Testa V., Zaggia S. R., Andreon G. L., Scaramella R., Djorgovski S. G. & De Carvalho R. 2000, A&A, 356, 127
Teuben, P. 1995, ASPC, 77, 398
Unavane, M., Wyse, R. F. G., & Gilmore, G. 1996, MNRAS, 278, 727
van den Bergh, S. 1993, AJ, 105, 971
van den Bergh, S. 1996, ApJ, 471, 31
VandenBerg, D.A., Brogaard, K., Leaman, R. & Casagrande, L. 2013, ApJ, 775, 134
Vande Putte, D. & Cropper, M. 2009, MNRAS, 392, 113
Villanova, S., Geisler, D. & Piotto, G. 2010, ApJ, 722, 18
Williams, M.E.K., Steinmetz, M., Sharma, S. et al. 2011, ApJ, 728, 102
Willett, B. A., Newberg, H. J., Zhang, H., Yanny, B., & Beers, T. 2009, ApJ, 697, 207
Wilson, C. P. 1975, AJ, 80, 175
White, S. D. M. 1978, MNRAS, 184, 185
Wright, E., Eisenhardt, P. R. M., & Mainzer, A. K. et al. 2010, AJ, 140, 1868
Wylie-de Boer, E., Freeman, K. & Williams, M.E.K. 2010, AJ, 139, 636
Wylie-de Boer, E., Freeman, K., Williams, M.E.K., Steinmetz, M., Munari, U. & Keller, S. 2012, ApJ, 755, 35
Yong, D. & Grundahl, F. 2008, ApJ, 672, 29
York, D. G., et al. 2000, AJ, 120, 1579
Zinnecker H., Keable C. J., Dunlop J. S., Cannon R. D, & Griffiths W. K., 1988, in Grindlay J. E., Philip A. G. D., eds, The Harlow Shapley Symposium on Globular Cluster Systems in Galaxies Vol. 126 of IAU Symposium, The Nuclei of Nucleated Dwarf Elliptical Galaxies - are they Globular Clusters?, p. 603
Zocchi, A., Bertin, G. & Varri, A. L. 2012, A&A, 539, 65